REMARKS

Claims 11-30 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 8, 9 and 10 have been amended. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this application and other applications. Claims 1-10 and 31-37 are pending in this application.

The Office Action notes that various trademarks are used in the application. As noted in the MPEP, Section 608.01(v), the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, but the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might be adversely affect their validity as trademarks. In the Examiner's Note under form paragraph 6.20 provided in the MPEP, it is noted that for a trademark each letter of the work should be capitalized "or include a proper trademark symbol, such as ™ or ® following the word." (Emphasis added). Each trademark used in the specification is followed by the proper symbol ™ or ® as required. Applicants respectfully submit that the proprietary nature of the marks is respected by use of the appropriate symbol and request the Examiner to clarify any objections with respect to the use of trademarks in the specification.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13-16, 18, 19, 21, 23-35, 27-33, 35 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeCarpentier (U.S. 4,752,950) in view of Lee (U.S. 5,657,689) as suggested by Eppley. Claims 4, 7, 10, 12, 17, 20, 22, 26 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LeCarpentier in view of Lee as suggested by Eppley and further in view of obvious variations. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 as amended is directed to a mailing system that comprises "a plurality of devices associated with mail preparation, each of said plurality of devices adapted to communicate with other of said plurality of devices via a wireless communication; a gateway server adapted to communicate with each of said plurality of devices via a wireless communication, said gateway server being coupled to a communication network, said gateway server and said plurality of devices forming a local network, said gateway server acting as a master of said local network, each of said plurality of devices communicating with another of said plurality of devices via a wireless communication through said gateway server; and a remote device coupled to said communication network, said remote device

communicating with said gateway server via said communication network, said gateway server creating a proxy for each of said plurality of devices in said local network, wherein a service of at least one of said plurality of devices can be invoked by said remote device utilizing said created proxy for said at least one of said plurality of devices."

LeCarpentier is directed to a remote control system for a set of franking machines which are geographically dispersed. Each franking head is connected to a local concentrator station via a data transmission link, and each local station is itself connected via a telephone channel to a central remote meter-reading station of the central organization, which local stations both monitor the franking machines and collect operating data read from the franking heads by means of bases, and also communicate the operating data to the central station after grouping the data and calling the central station via a telephone channel. (Col. 1, line 55 to Col. 2, line 1). In LeCarpentier, the central station serves as a concentrator for an entire set of franking machines to store and process all of the management data relating to operation of the franking machines in order to bill the franking performed and without processing the franking per se. (Col. 2, lines 45-53).

There is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in LeCarpentier of "a plurality of devices associated with mail preparation, each of said plurality of devices adapted to communicate with other of said plurality of devices via a wireless communication" as is recited in claim 1. The franking machines 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D, 1E, 1F, 1G in LeCarpentier do not communicate with each other by any means, nevertheless by a wireless communication. There is also no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in LeCarpentier of "a gateway server adapted to communicate with each of said plurality of devices via a wireless communication, said gateway server being coupled to a communication network, said gateway server and said plurality of devices forming a local network, said gateway server acting as a master of said local network, each of said plurality of devices communicating with another of said plurality of devices via a wireless communication through said gateway server" as is recited in claim 1. The local stations 4X, 4Y and 4Z in LeCarpentier do not act as a master of any type of local network, as they simply monitor the machines connected thereto and collect operating information supplied by the franking machines. Furthermore, the franking machines do not communicate with each other through the local stations. There is also no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in LeCarpentier of "a remote device coupled to said communication network, said remote device communicating with said gateway server via said communication

network, said gateway server creating a proxy for each of said plurality of devices in said local network, wherein a service of at least one of said plurality of devices can be invoked by said remote device utilizing said created proxy for said at least one of said plurality of devices" as is recited in claim 1. These features are simply not present anywhere in LeCarpentier.

Lee is directed to a franking machine system in which a franking machine intended for operation at a predetermined location cannot be operated for franking mail if it is moved away from that location. A franking machine includes receiving means operative to receive a wireless signal sent from a transmission means that transmits a predetermined signal. The franking machine is operative in response to receipt of the predetermined signal by the receiving means to carry out a franking operation to frank a mail item and is inoperative to carry out a franking operation when the predetermined signal is not received. (Col. 1, lines 50-58).

Note first that in Lee there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion of a gateway server that forms a local network with the plurality of devices and acts as a master of said local network. The secure unit 32 of Lee is no more than a transmitter that may have the form of a secure safe like housing secured to a wall of the users premises and connected to a telephone line 33 whereby communication with the secure unit may be effected by means of the telephone network 34. (Col. 2, lines 57-61). The secure unit 32 does not establish any type of local network, nor does it act as the master of any type of local network. It simply transmits a signal, which is not the same as establishing a local network and acting as the master of the local network.

There is also no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in Lee of each of the plurality of devices communicating with another of the plurality of devices via a wireless communication through the gateway server as is recited in claim 1. In Lee, there is no discussion anywhere of any of the franking machines 30_1 to 30_n communicating with each other through any type of communication path, nevertheless through a gateway server.

There is also no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in Lee of "a remote device coupled to said communication network, said remote device communicating with said gateway server via said communication network, said gateway server creating a proxy for each of said

plurality of devices in said local network, wherein a service of at least one of said plurality of devices can be invoked by said remote device utilizing said created proxy for said at least one of said plurality of devices" as is recited in claim 1. These features are simply not present anywhere in Lee.

The article to Eppley does not cure any of the above deficiencies, as it is directed simply to radio-based data communication trends and does not disclose, teach or suggest any of the features described above.

There is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in any of the references, either alone or in any combination, of a mailing system that comprises "a plurality of devices associated with mail preparation, each of said plurality of devices adapted to communicate with other of said plurality of devices via a wireless communication; a gateway server adapted to communicate with each of said plurality of devices via a wireless communication, said gateway server being coupled to a communication network, said gateway server and said plurality of devices forming a local network, said gateway server acting as a master of said local network, each of said plurality of devices communicating with another of said plurality of devices via a wireless communication through said gateway server; and a remote device coupled to said communication network, said remote device communicating with said gateway server via said communication network, said gateway server creating a proxy for each of said plurality of devices in said local network, wherein a service of at least one of said plurality of devices can be invoked by said remote device utilizing said created proxy for said at least one of said plurality of devices" as is recited in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record. Claims 2-10, dependent upon claim 1, are allowable along with claim 1 and on their own merits.

Claim 31 is directed to a method for invoking a service of a mailing device by a remote device, the mailing device belonging to a wireless mailing system, where the method comprises "registering said mailing device with a gateway server, said registration being done via a wireless communication between said mailing device and said gateway server;

creating a proxy for said registered mailing device and storing said proxy in said gateway server; establishing a communication between said remote device and said gateway

server via a network; selecting a service associated with registered mailing device via said communication between said remote device and said gateway server; and invoking said selected service via said proxy by said remote device."

The Office Action has not provided any indication where any of the limitations of claim 31 is allegedly disclosed, taught or suggested in any of the cited references, either alone or in any combination. There is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in LeCarpentier, Lee or Eppley, either alone or in any combination, of registering a mailing device with a gateway server, said registration being done via a wireless communication between said mailing device and said gateway server; creating a proxy for said registered mailing device and storing said proxy in said gateway server; establishing a communication between said remote device and said gateway server via a network; selecting a service associated with registered mailing device via said communication between said remote device and said gateway server; and invoking said selected service via said proxy by said remote device as is recited in claim 31.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 31 is allowable over the prior art of record. Claims 32-37, dependent upon claim 31, are allowable along with claim 31 and on their own merits.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of this case are in a condition for allowance and favorable action thereon is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Brian A. Lemm
Reg. No. 43,748
Attorney for Applicants
Telephone (203) 924-3836

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and
Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000